

Virginia, to the position of Inspector General for the United States House of Representatives for the 109th Congress, effective January 4, 2005.

#### CAFTA

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement coming in front of Congress, fact number one: The economic output of the six Central American countries entering into this agreement with the United States is equal to the economic output of Columbus, Ohio; Orlando, Florida; or the entire State of Kansas.

What this trade agreement, CAFTA, is all about: It is not about selling American goods into six small, poor countries in Central America. It is about outsourcing jobs. It is about weakening our economy. It is about losing our manufacturing base. It is about hiring low-income workers in Guatemala and Honduras and Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

This agreement hurts American workers. It depresses American wages. It does nothing to lift up standards of living in Central America.

CAFTA is a dysfunctional cousin of the North American Free Trade Agreement. It will continue to wreak havoc on the economy of Central America and Latin America and do nothing for American manufacturing.

#### RHETORIC VS. REALITY, SOCIAL SECURITY DEFINED

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to clarify a few points about strengthening and preserving Social Security.

Unfortunately, partisan opposition groups are playing word games with Social Security reform. Let me tell the Members what these words mean to the average American.

Privatization means taking Social Security completely out of the hands of government and turning the program over to a private entity. I will never vote to privatize Social Security.

Personal accounts means giving younger workers a choice to invest a portion of their tax dollars into safe and secure accounts. Most importantly, these accounts would be owned by the individuals and protected from the D.C. practice of using these funds for general spending. This is not privatization.

I would hope that instead of slinging half-truths and misrepresentations, those groups opposed to any sort of reform would instead present choices of their own and meet Republicans at the negotiating table in a productive, constructive manner.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### NO FLY, NO BUY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, for years people have been hearing me talk about gun violence in this country, and the debates over tougher gun laws have been defined as "social issues."

Gun violence has had tragic consequences for so many families, including my own. Gun violence presents a tremendous burden to our police departments, and I see it in my own district on Long Island where we are dealing with so many gangs. With the expiration of the assault weapons ban, many police departments will be outgunned by gangs and criminals. That is why basically we had the assault weapons ban put in place back in 1994.

Gun violence also costs this society over \$100 billion a year. Most of that \$100 billion is paid with tax dollars. It is estimated each shooting costs our economy \$1 million in health care, police work, and lost productivity.

Mr. Speaker, the social costs of gun violence are ever increasing, but since September 11, the threat of gun violence has become an important homeland security issue as well.

We are at war, and our lack of tough gun laws allows our enemies to arm themselves right here in our country. People can go to gun shows and be able to buy guns. They can go into different gun stores across this country with false ID and be able to buy guns. We know through the FBI that 44 times just since January the terrorists that have been on a no-fly list have been able to go and buy those guns. In all but nine instances, the purchases were allowed to go through. Affiliation with a terrorist group does not appear on any background checklist whatsoever.

There certainly have been many more instances of suspected members of terrorist groups trying to buy guns since then. But since the Justice Department destroys background check records after only 24 hours, we will never know, unfortunately, until there is a tragedy.

So not only are we allowing suspected terrorists to arm themselves, we are also destroying the records indicating how many guns they have bought and how many they own. We are destroying critical intelligence in the war on terror.

The question my constituents ask me all the time or when I go around the country and speak is, "Why are these people allowed to buy guns in the first place?" It defies common sense. We

saw what these terrorists are capable of, armed with only box cutters purchased at a hardware store; and starting last week, people are not even allowed to bring a cigarette lighter onto a plane. Then why do we make it so easy for our enemies to buy firearms and ammunition within our borders?

Since 9/11 we have adopted a multitude of new laws in the wake of the war on terror, and I agree with those laws.

□ 1930

No one is spared from the reach of these new laws. Some of these laws may be an inconvenience for some; but if it prevents one terrorist from boarding a plane, it is a good law. But our gun laws are dangerously out of step with the war on terror. The same people who cannot board a plane can walk into a gun store and purchase a handheld weapon of mass destruction. By the way, that is assault weapons, also. This is ridiculous.

Let me set the record straight. I am not out to take away the guns of any law-abiding citizen. We need common-sense gun safety regulations that protect law-abiding gun owners while making it tougher for terrorists and criminals to obtain these guns. That is why I have introduced the No Fly No Buy bill.

This bill would deny those on the Transportation Security Administration's No Fly List from purchasing firearms in this country. Granted, the No Fly List includes some law-abiding citizens who are on the list in error. But it is the only Federal terrorist watch list that allows innocent people to get their names removed. Other Federal lists without practical application may be just as inaccurate, but afford no due process to those wrongly listed. My bill would ensure that those people incorrectly listed on the No Fly List would be able to get their names off the list as soon as possible; and then they would be able to complete their gun purchase, no questions asked. Again, an inconvenience for some, but necessary steps to ensure terrorists are not buying guns in our country.

The Federal Government is charged with protecting us from terror. That is what 9/11 has taught us. I understand the second amendment concerns of law-abiding gun owners. These laws can co-exist with responsible people's rights to hunt and protect their families. Responsible gun ownership is a right of all law-abiding Americans, but we must also have a responsibility to protect law-abiding Americans from acts of terror and crime.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing gangs across this Nation multiply, and we also know that they still have easy access to get guns. We can stop this crime wave that we see going through our country. We should be stopping this. We can save certainly an awful lot of money on medical costs. Our communities, all of a sudden, they are asking themselves, is it safe to go out at